REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-7 and 9-14 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1, 2, 9, 11, 12, and 14 have been amended. No claims have been added or cancelled. Therefore, claims 1-7 and 9-14 are present for examination. Claims 1 and 2 are independent claims.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103, Sato in view of MacInnis

Claims 1-6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0106024 A1 issued to Sato et al. ("**Sato**") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0215018 A1 issued to MacInnis et al.("**MacInnis**").

Claims 1 and 2 have been amended to recite a "picture selector", an "interface section", and "video stream supplying section." Specifically, claim 1 has been amended to define the "picture selector" as a "picture selector [which] generates a subset image signal of the first image signal by extracting pictures of one or more specific types in frames or fields from the first image signal and uses the extracted pictures to generate the subset image signal whose effective length is reduced, and supplies the subset image signal at a first bit rate to the first decoder, in which the first bit rate of the subset image signal is set to correspond to the decoding rate of the subset image signal by the first decoder." Claim 2 has been amended to define the "interface section" as an "interface section [which] generates a subset image signal of the first image signal by extracting pictures of one or more specific types in frames or fields from the first image signal and uses the extracted pictures to generate the subset image signal whose effective length is reduced, and supplies the subset image signal at a first bit rate to the first decoder, in which the first bit rate of the subset image signal is set to correspond to the decoding rate of the subset image signal by the first decoder." Further, claims 1 and 2 have been amended to define the "video stream supplying section" as a "video stream supplying section [which] supplies the first image signal at a second bit rate to the picture selector to compensate for an amount of code of the pictures which are not extracted by the picture selector, in which the second bit rate of the first image signal is set higher than the first bit rate of the subset image signal."

Applicants submit that both Sato and MacInnis, individually, or when combined, fail to teach or suggest at least the limitations recited above. Specifically, as recited above, in claim 1, the picture selector supplies the subset image signal at a first bit rate to the first decoder by which the first bit rate of the subset image signal is set to correspond to the decoding rate of the subset image, and the video stream supplying section supplies the first image signal at a second bit rate to the picture selector to compensate for an amount of code of the pictures which are not extracted by the picture selector, in which the second bit rate of the first image signal is set higher than the first bit rate of the subset image signal. Claim 2 recites that the interface section supplies the subset image signal at a first bit rate to the first decoder by which the first bit rate of the subset image signal is set to correspond to the decoding rate of the subset image signal, and the video stream supplying section supplies the first image signal at a second bit rate to the interface section to compensate for an amount of code of the pictures which are not extracted by the interface section, in which the second bit rate of the first image signal is set higher than the first bit rate of the subset image signal. According to aspects of the invention as presently claimed, the picture selector, the interface section, and the video stream supplying section recited above are configured such that the processing capability of the decoder is exploited in order to the maximum the decoder's capability and allow for high speed transcoding to be performed.

Applicants submit that Sato discloses the following: "gross code amounts (bit amounts) R allocated to VOP", "average quantization scale code Q" and "global complexity measure X." However, the idea that executing transcoding of information in which MPEG2 image compression information is inputted and MPEG4 image compression information is outputted (*i.e.*, utilizing "gross code amounts (bit amounts) R allocated to VOP", "average quantization scale code Q", and "global complexity measure X") are merely used to realize the "optimum code amount distribution" in "MPEG4 image encoding." Thus, in Sato, the setting of a processing speed (or a bit rate) isn't described, and neither is the "picture selector" which supplies a subset image signal at a first bit rate to a first decoder, where the first bit rate of the subset image signal is set to correspond to the decoding rate of the subset image signal by the first decoder. Furthermore, the "video stream supplying section" which supplies the first image

signal at a second bit rate to the picture selector to compensate for an amount of code of the pictures which are not extracted by the picture selector, where the second bit rate of the first image signal being set higher than the first bit rate of the subset image signal, is not disclosed. In addition, neither the "interface section" which supplies subset image signal at a first bit rate to a first decoder, where the first bit rate of the subset image signal being set to correspond to the decoding rate of the subset image signal by the first decoder, nor the "video stream supplying section" which supplies the first image signal at a second bit rate to the interface section to compensate for an amount of code of the pictures which are not extracted by the interface section, where the second bit rate of the first image signal being set higher than the first bit rate of the subset image signal, is disclosed.

Furthermore, MacInnis discloses that when the video signal with a large number of bits is inputted to a decoder, a much higher decoding rate than the average decoding rate is utilized (*see* MacInnis at paragraph 0037). However, MacInnis fails to disclose varying the bit stream which supplies the video signal. MacInnis also fails to disclose both the "picture selector" which supplies subset image signal at a first bit rate to a first decoder, where the first bit rate of the subset image signal being set to correspond to the decoding rate of the subset image signal by the first decoder, and the "video stream supplying section" which supplies the first image signal at a second bit rate to the picture selector to compensate for an amount of code of the pictures which are not extracted by the picture selector, where the second bit rate of the first image signal being set higher than the first bit rate of the subset image signal. In addition, neither the "interface section" which supplies subset image signal at a first bit rate to a first decoder, the first bit rate of the subset image signal being set to correspond to the decoding rate of the subset image signal by the first decoder, nor the "video stream supplying section" which supplies the first image signal at a second bit rate to the interface section to compensate for an amount of code of the pictures which are not extracted by the interface section, where the second bit rate of the first image signal being set higher than the first bit rate of the subset image signal, is disclosed by MacInnis.

Thus, for at least these reasons, claims 1 and 2 are believed to be allowable over Sato in view of MacInnis, either individually or when combined in any combination.

Furthermore, dependent claims 3-7 and 9-14 depend from claims 1 or 2 and therefore are believed to be allowable over Sato in view of MacInnis at least by virtue of their dependence from an allowable base claim.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 7 and 9-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato in view of MacInnis, and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0181588 A1 issued to Okada (**"Okada"**).

Okada, Sato and MacInnis, fails to teach or suggest elements described above with respect to claims 1 and 2. Thus, dependent claim 7 and 9-14 which depend from claims 1 or 2 are allowable at least by the virtue of being dependent on an allowable base claim. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 7 and 9-14 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles W. Gray
Reg. No. 61,345

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
CWG:s5s
61405211 v1